

# *Interview Summary*

Application No.

09/671,731

Applicant(s)

GRASSL ET AL

Examiner

Grigory Gurshman

Art Unit

2132

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Grigory Gurshman.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Benjamin Urcia.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 July 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: Pearce and Sloan.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
GILBERTO BARRON JR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner suggested clarifying the independent claim 1 and making the language more consistent with the independent claim 10 in order to demonstrate that both of the claims are patentably distinguishable from the art of record. In particular, examiner suggested moving the recitation "component containing an overwritable memory" from the preamble of the claim 1 into the limitations. Applicant's representative had agreed with examiner's suggestion..